



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,041	09/04/2003	Sajeev Madhavan	200209680-01	8483

22879 7590 11/20/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHO, HONG SOL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2419

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/20/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 7/28/2008. Claims 1-19 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagidate et al (US 6128664), hereinafter referred to as Yanagidate, in view of Lee (US 7047561).

Re claims 1, 9 and 17, Yanagidate discloses an address-translating device providing address translation between a terminal (figure 2, element 12a) with a private address, 10.1.1.20, located in a private network and a terminal (figure 2, element 11a) with a public address, 133.110.10.31, (*first public IP address*) located in a public network (*automatically generating network address translation (NAT) data to enable a private*

host having a private IP address to communicate with a public host having a first public IP address, said private host being connected to a private network, said public host being connected to a public network, figure 2; column 5, lines 13-20). Yanagidate discloses the address-translating device providing one of public addresses, 202.10.10.1 and 202.10.10-14, from an address translation table for communication to the terminal in the public network (*providing address translation between the private IP address and a second public IP address, the second public IP address being employed as one of a source IP address and a destination IP address for routing the communication between the private host and the public host through the public network, column 5, lines 32-36).* Yanagidate fails to disclose consulting a security policy associated with the private host to determine whether a communication between the private host and the public host is permissible before providing address translation service. Lee discloses examining an incoming and outgoing packets against security policies to restrict access to/from internal IP network (column 4, lines 22-26). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the address-translating device to implement the packet filter of Lee so that an access to the public network would be restricted based on filtering rules for secure communications.

Re claims 2 and 10, Yanagidate discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to disclose implementing an access list on security policy. Lee discloses using a packet filter with filtering rules (*a security policy with an access list*) (column 9, lines 17-21). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the address-translating device to implement the packet

filter with filtering rules of Lee so that an access to the public network would be restricted based on filtering rules for secure communications.

Re claims 3, 11 and 18, Yanagidate discloses one of second public addresses being a shared public IP address if the communication is initiated by the private host (column 5, lines 59-64).

Re claims 4, 12 and 19, Yanagidate discloses a second public address being a shared public IP address if the communication is initiated by the public host (column 7, lines 7-15).

Re claims 5 and 13, Yanagidate discloses the address-translating device with address translation table (a NAT table) (figure 2, element 14c).

Re claims 6 and 14, Yanagidate discloses sending a packet to a terminal to see if the terminal is reachable and removing the second public address from the address translation table if not reachable (*detecting a removal of said private host from said private network; and removing, using said software, said second public IP address from said database responsive to said detecting said removal of said private host*, column 7, lines 7-15).

Re claims 7 and 15, Yanagidate discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to disclose a packet filter with a generic security policy. Lee discloses using a packet filter with filtering rules (*a generic security policy*) (column 9, lines 17-21). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the address-translating device to implement the packet filter with

filtering rules of Lee so that an access to the public network would be restricted based on filtering rules for secure communications.

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagidate in view of Lee and further in view of Aukia et al (US 7047561), hereinafter referred to as Aukia.

Re claims 8 and 16, Yanagidate and Lee disclose all of the limitations of the base claim, but fail to disclose automatically generating NAT data for all private hosts affected by said generic policy after said generic policy is modified using said software. Aukia discloses modifying filtering rules to be used for a packet classifier. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yanagidate and Lee to implement the feature of modifying filtering rules so that modified security policy would be utilized in providing address translation service.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments that Lee fails to disclose consulting a security policy associated with the private host to determine whether a communication between the private host and the public host is permissible by stating that Lee's filtering

Art Unit: 2419

is packet based whereas the present claimed invention uses host policy to determine communication permissions. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lee's firewall discloses making decisions as to whether or not to pass data based upon one or more security policies employing a packet filter with filtering rules based on the type of packet, source and destination IP address of the packet, port number (security policy associated with a host, column 1, lines 24-28; column 4, lines 36-55).

Therefore, the Examiner concludes that the rejection of claims is proper.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2419

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong Cho whose telephone number is 571-272-3087.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri during 7 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hong Cho/

Hong Cho
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2419

10/24/2008